REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11 and 13 are pending. Claims 1, 6 and 11, which are independent, are amended to emphasize features not suggested by the cumulative teachings of the prior art references relied upon by the Examiner.

Before proceeding with a substantive reply to the Examiner's rejections, it is instructive to review the history of the prosecution of this application.

November 13, 2003, the Examiner issued the first non-final rejection based upon prior art. Applicant's representative responded with amended claims and arguments.

May 17, 2004, the Examiner replied with a non-final rejection based upon new prior art. Applicant's representative responded with amended claims and arguments.

January 19, 2005, the Examiner issued a new prior art rejection and made that rejection final. Applicant's representative responded by pointing out that the references relied upon are not available as prior art against this application.

August 9, 2005, the Examiner issued a new non-final prior art rejection. Applicant's representative responded with amended claims and arguments.

January 10, 2006, the Examiner issued a final rejection based solely upon 35 USC 112. The claims were not rejected in view of prior art. Applicant's representative responded with

arguments, and filed a Request for Continued Examination to obtain the entry of those arguments.

August 2, 2006, the Examiner issued a non-final rejection based upon prior art, which was substantially the same as the prior art rejection of August 9, 2005. Applicant's representative responded with amended claims and arguments.

December 7, 2006, the Examiner issued a final rejection based solely upon 35 USC 112. The claims were not rejected in view of prior art. Applicant's representative responded with amended claims and arguments. This response was not entered; and applicant filed a Request for Continued Examination.

April 7, 2007, the Examiner issued a non-final rejection based solely upon 35 USC 112. As in the December 7, 2006 final rejection, the claims were not rejected in view of prior art. Applicant's representative filed a response that addressed and resolved the section 112 rejection.

October 5, 2007, the Examiner issued the present final rejection based upon prior art. This final rejection is substantially the same as the prior art rejections of August 2, 2006 and August 9, 2005.

It is respectfully submitted that, notwithstanding the extensive prosecution history of the present application, the October 5, 2007 rejection should not have been made final. As is clear from the aforenoted summary of the prosecution of this application and applicant's response to the non-final rejection of April 7, 2007, Applicant's response did not necessitate the new ground of rejection that was not present in the April 7, 2007 office action.

Nevertheless, accompanying this response to the October 5, 2007 office action is applicant's third Request for Continued Examination.

Turning now to the merits of the Office Action under reply, it is respectfully submitted that applicant's claim 1, as presented herein, is patentably distinct over the cumulative teachings of Michener, Kim, Na and Knee. The Examiner relies upon Na for an alleged teaching of the claimed feature of "converting the data structure of the second broadcast signal [, including] rearranging a timestamp and a packet length of a transport stream of the second broadcast signal," as recited by claim 1. Na does not rearrange a timestamp. Rather, Na merely inserts a timestamp into each TS packet, as described at column 7, lines 7-11 and lines 38-43. This insertion of a timestamp is not "rearranging" a time stamp. Furthermore, Na does not "rearrange []... a packet length of a transport stream of the second broadcast signal," as recited by Applicant's claim 1. Rather, Na uses packets having block units of a fixed size, namely, 24 bytes (column 7, lines 12 and 45). Neither Michener nor Kim nor Knee cures this deficiency of Na. For this reason alone, the cumulative teachings of Michener, Kim, Na and Knee are insufficient to meet all of the recitations of claim 1.

Nevertheless, to further clarify the differences between claim 1 and the teachings of these references, claim 1 is further amended to state:

> wherein if said judging means judges that said received digital satellite broadcasting signal is in said first format, said analog signal is outputted from said first output means as the output of the digital satellite broadcasting signal, and if said judging means judges that said received digital satellite broadcasting signal is in said second format, said third broadcast signal is outputted from said second output means as the output of the digital satellite broadcasting signal.

It is appreciated the Examiner relies upon Michener in combination with Kim for allegedly describing judging the format of a received digital satellite signal and, if in a first format, an analog signal is outputted as the output of the digital satellite signal, whereas if in a second format, a third broadcast signal is outputted from the digital interface as the output of the digital satellite signal. However, it is respectfully submitted, the combination of Michener and

Kim fails to suggest this feature. Michener outputs standard serial digital interface signals to the IEEE 1394 interface (Fig. 5); and these signals are substantially the same as Kim's MPEG signals. That is, neither Michener nor Kim outputs a third broadcast signal of converted data structure.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is unobvious over the combination of Michener, Kim, Na and Knee for those reasons discussed above. The withdrawal of the rejection of this claim as being obvious is respectfully solicited.

Claims 6 and 11 are similar to claim 1 in that these independent claims include the same limitations found in claim 1 that have been argued above. Therefore, claims 6 and 11 are patentably distinct over the combination of Michener, Kim, Na and Knee for those reasons discussed above.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 depend from claim 1; claims 7, 8 and 10 depend from claim 6; and claim 13 depends from claim 11. Since these dependent claims include all of the limitations recited by the independent claim from which the respective dependent claim depends, it follows that the dependent claims are patentably distinct over the combination of Michener, Kim, Na and Knee for the same reasons discussed above.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, 11 and 13 and the allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

Statements appearing above in respect to the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinions of the undersigned attorney and, in the event the Examiner disagrees with any of such opinions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800